CA2 ALXC 25
82K23

Mr. Kesler Goes To Edmonton:
The Effect of a Populist M.L.A. on
Alberta Politics and the Alberta Legislature

Bretton M. Loney

Legislative Intern 1981-82

June, 1982

On the wintry night of February 17, 1982 the calm residing over the Alberta political scene and the silence of the Olds, Alberta night were irrevocably shattered by jubilant cheers, reverberating from Western Canada Concept's main street headquarters, which signalled the election of a new provincial politician, Gordon Kesler.

As the glare of this high profile by-election began to fade it became apparent to political observers that there was an aspect of Kesler and the W.C.C. that was even more important than the contentious separatism issue which had dominated the campaign. The key to the W.C.C., its by-election victory, and its future was believed to be the party's highly populist nature. Gordon Kesler and the W.C.C. had rekindled the fires of populism in Alberta. As political columnist Charles Lynch aptly stated:

> Kesler's Western Canada Concept is populist, the way Social Credit was when it swept to power in 1935. But instead of funny money, the winner of Wednesday's by-election in Olds-Didsbury offered freedom from eastern oppression.[1]

In a province where a governing party's dominace is measured in decades, yet where change once it comes spreads with the speed and ferocity of a prairie fire, this victory was viewed by political pundits and old timers alike as a spark. A spark which, if caught by the winds of change, could either spread to envelope the province or blow back upon itself and smother.

In the heady aftermath of his by-election vitory, Kesler, as depicted by his supporters and the media, took on the aura of the young Senator in the 1939 film "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington". In the film Jimmy Stewart portrayed an honest, idealistic Senator battling on behalf of the little guy against the system. However, as envisaged by Kesler supporters this script would be

"Mr. Kesler Goes to Edmonton", a representative of average Albertans spurring forward to battle big government in general and the vile federal government in particular.

As is indicated the main focus of this paper will be the effect of populist M.L.A. Gordon Kesler on Alberta politics and the Alberta Legislature. However, before proceeding into that area of discussion a definition of populism is needed. In addition it must also be established that Kesler and the W.C.C. meet the criteria established by such a definition.

Populism is a very broad term which has been used to encompass a variety of political movements and groups across the world. As a result it is difficult to define; however, one of the best attempts is the highly abstract definition developed by Professor Peter Wiles, to whom populism is;

> any creed or movement based on the following major premise: virtue resides in the simple people, who are the overwhelming majority, and in their collective traditions.[2]

While this definition points one in the right direction it is too general to be useful as a interpretive tool. However, when supplemented by the general populist characteristics outlined by Professor Peter Sinclair one can effectively use the combination to determine what parties or groups are populist in nature. The following populist characteristics are taken from Professor Sinclair's paper on the subject in which he states that populism;

1. Stresses the worth of the common people and advocates their political supremacy.
2. Rejects intermediate associations between the mass and leaders. Political organizations do develop, but their structure is influenced by the populist desire for democracy.
3. Directs protest against some group which lies outside local society, ie. big interests from the East.

4. Demands the reform of the capitalist structure rather than social revolution. Innovation is accepted provided the aim is to modify the existing order by making it more bearable for the common people.[3]

As is clearly evident from studying Gordon Kesler and the W.C.C. there is a genuine belief on the part of both in the ordinary, average Albertan. They stress time and time again in meeting halls across the province that it's "the people" and their opinions and virtues that are important. While this is a time honoured political ploy it takes on a note of sincerity when Gordon Kesler says it and then passes around his phone number while saying "I can't do a job without your help."[4]

Kesler and the W.C.C. have also attempted to keep their party structure relatively democratic and open. The party respects and gives credence to the decisions of constituency associations and has plans for a major policy convention in July, 1982. While recent events have called into question the democracy within the party, both the party and its interim leader, Kesler, have remained relatively accessible in light of the immense pressures on them.

One of the more obvious characteristics of the W.C.C. is that it directs protest against a group outside of local, Western Canadian, society. Regardless of the future of the independence issue it will remain an integral part of W.C.C. policy to blame the woes of the West on Central Canada. Even divorced from the independence issue the W.C.C. will no doubt continue to rail against a political and economic system which they feel is tilted to the advantage of Central Canada and woefully unfair to Albertans.

The W.C.C.'s other major characteristic is its strong stand for Free Enterprise. The W.C.C. advocates a market place with less government

involvement, which they see as the root of high interest rates, high inflation and high taxes. However, the W.C.C. is not advocating laissez-faire captialism or monopoly capitalism, but rather a reformed market system in which small business can flourish. Kesler and the W.C.C. advocate tinkering with the capitalist system rather than any major transformation of society.

In addition to possessing the populist characteristics outlined by Professor Sinclair and to falling within the perimeter of Professor Wiles' definition the W.C.C. also espouses various traditional populist planks. Proposals such as the citizens' right to referendum, initiative and recall, an elected Senate and open government have been the traditional stock of Western Canadian populist parties since the early 1920s.

Thus, the W.C.C. and Gordon Kesler are clearly populist in nature. While this in itself is interesting to note, it takes on more significance when viewed in the context of Alberta's political history and its noted penchant for populist parties.

The key to understanding Alberta's political history, and its support for populist parties, is set forth in C. B. Macpherson's classic book "Democracy in Alberta: Social Credit and the Party System". In this book Macpherson suggests that the unusual nature of the Alberta economy has had a tremendous effect on the development of Alberta politics. Macpherson states;

> Two features of it (the Alberta economy) are particularly important for their political implications: its subordination to the outside economy, and its small porpertied basis.[5]

The effect of the unusual Alberta economy was to severely stunt the growth of an alternate party system. In a province of relative homogenous class composition, primarily petit bourgeoisie, alternate parties were not needed either to express or moderate conflicts of interest.[6]

In addition because of Alberta's quasi-colonial economic status it was well recognized by Albertans that a strong provincial government was needed to stand up to the national government and make effective demands on it. This was made all the more important by the fact that as a creature of the federal government Alberta's quasi-colonial status was political as well as economic.

In such circumstances provincial parties which were mere subsections of the federal parties had little to commend themselves, particularly as weapons against the federal government. For these reasons there was a general revolt against the alternate party system, a system alien to the West, and against "partyism" in general in Alberta. As Professor Paul Sharp noted; "Western farmers were convinced that the older parties were often corrupt and unduly responsive to eastern and industrial influences".[8]

The two features of the unusual Alberta economy that had negated the growth of an alternate party system also made Alberta fertile ground for the rise of populist sentiment. As a result Albertans under the harsh economic conditions of post World War One looked past the traditional parties. Instead, they turned to reform movements which claimed solutions to the class problems of the petit bourgeoisie within the framework of capitalism.

The U.F.A. and the Social Credit were such populist movements and eventually they became bona fide political parties of a rather radical nature. However, as Macpherson stated;

> The radicalism of both was that of a quasi-colonial society of independent producers, in rebellion against eastern imperialism but not against the property system.[9]

Both parties were populist and comparatively radical upon entering office and were able to maintain power for long periods of time due to the lack of

an alternative party system. During their tenures both offered efficient and rather scandal-free "business government" or in other words, good administration. However, in the case of both parties eventually their governments, the leadership of their movements, and their movements themselves became increasingly conservative and gradually fell behind the changes in Alberta society.

As a result the stage was set for the sudden rise of new movements or parties, between long intervals of one party domination, to sweep the government out of office. Thus, an Alberta tradition was born, one on whose coattails the Progessive Conservatives road to power in 1971.

The Progressive Conservative victory of 1971 was a major aberration in Alberta politics. The Progressive Conservatives were the first traditional party and the first non-populist party to hold the reigns of power in Alberta since 1921. While one might question just how populist in nature the U.F.A. and the Social Credit were in their declining years of authority, they were nonetheless populist upon entering office.

The Progressive Conservatives of 1971, were clearly not a populist party. Their base of support was the urban middle class rather than the rural petite bourgeoisie. In namesake as well as in structure they were clearly the model of a traditional party. While they did eventually capitalize on the quasi-colonial sentiments of Albertans this was not evident in the 1971 campaign. Finally, their platform did not advocate any reforms to the capitalist structure, but merely supported the general principles of private enterprise.

Research done by Howard and Tamara Palmer has indicated that economic and social changes in Alberta were largely responsible for the Tory victory. Their research suggests that neither ideology nor issues had an impact on the 1971 election results. Instead they suggest that the 1971 election highlighted an outdated populist image projected by the Social Credit as compared to

the middle class respectability of the Progessive Conservatives.[10]

By 1975 the activities of political life in the province centered increasingly around natural resource policy and the relationship between the Alberta and federal government with regard to this subject. As a result Lougheed took on the role of defender of the people of Alberta and the effect was a substantial realignment of the Alberta electorate. As David Elton and Arthur Goddard stated;

> This fundamental realignment seems to have centered around personality and image, but also upon the Progressive Conservative Party's ability to establish itself as the defender of the province's rights in its struggle with external forces such as other provinces and the federal government.[11]

Thus after setting present day Alberta politics in historical context our focus comes back to the ramifications of the election of populist Gordon Kesler to the Alberta Legislature. There is no doubt that Albertans of all walks of life keenly awaited the arrival of Kesler into the Legislature, for after his election the province was seething with political activity, mostly of the W.C.C. political stripe. Interest in politics was heightened to a level not seen since 1971, or possible 1935.

Into this gathering storm marched the catalyst, Gordon Kesler, who took his seat as the W.C.C. member for Olds-Didsbury on March 1, 1982. The effect of Kesler's presence on the Alberta Legislature was both immediate and direct. From his well publicized first day in the legislature until the last day of the spring sitting it was apparent that the other political parties, particularly the Tories, and the Social Credit, were thrust into the difficult political

position of having to react to him rather than vice versa.

Even to the most casual political observer this was immediately evident in the Social Credit Party's activities in the Legislature. On Kesler's first day in the Legislature, the Leader of the Official Opposition voraciously attacked the Tories claiming that Albertans had lost on both the energy and constitutional deals. While disagreement with the government is the time honoured role and, to an extent, duty of the Opposition this was a fair amount of backpeddling for a man who had called the constitutional deal "a great day for Canada".[12] It was viewed by many political observers, particularly columnist Don Braid, as a blatant political grab for a piece of Kesler's political territory.

Much the same thing could be said of the Official Opposition precedent setting "Speech to the Throne" which called for the clarification of property rights in Canada's new constitution and the sale of the Alberta government's shares in Pacific Western Airlines. Clearly Social Credit was trying to counter the threat posed by the W.C.C. by adopting some of the newer party's policies.

The governing Tories were also thrust into the role of reacting to Kesler. While governing parties in a parliamentary system must always react, in some form or another, to statements or questions put forward by opposition members, they generally set the tone and the agenda for the Legislature. However, Kesler was able to catch the Tories off-guard and often placed them in quite a dilemma.

Kesler's questions on issues such as government ownership of P.W.A. and provincial subsidy grants to beef producers put the pro private sector Tories in the untenable position of having someone "out free enterprise" them. Kesler's question on such topics often pointed out the divergent views

on such issues within the Tory caucus itself.

In addition, Kesler was able to outflank the Tories and establish a role in federal-provincial conflict. The political importance of being able to make a political stand on the sacred ground of federal-provincial conflict cannot be overemphasized in Alberta. As Professor Peter Gibbons stated; "to deny the opposition a role in federal-provincial conflict is effectively to relegate the opposition to the sidelines of provincial politics."[13]

Due to the W.C.C.'s strong anti-federal government position Kesler was able to take stands, on such key federal-provincial issues as fiscal payments, the Canadian Constitution and the National Energy Program, that were different than the Tories. Simply stated, Kesler was politically able to take much tougher stands against the federal government than the Tories, the traditional defenders of Alberta. Undoubtedly this caused the Tories a great deal of consternation.

However, the most important effect Gordon Kesler had on the Alberta Legislature, and possibly one of the more longlasting, was his inadvertant de-emphasis of its role in Alberta politics. Kesler and the W.C.C.'s triumphant entrance onto the political scene took the focus of provincial politics away from the Legislature and to the community halls and school gyms across the province where they drew a large and curious electorate. As Edmonton Journal columnist Don Braid noted;

> The message is that Alberta's political action is no longer in the musty legislature (if it ever was), but in the meeting halls, bars and living rooms of the province.[14]

The introduction of the populist Kesler into the Legislature also de-emphasized the Legislature's role in provincial politics by undermining the Opposition's unofficial "in-house" coalition. Throughout the fall joint action and cooperation on specific issues by the tiny opposition had scored

numerous political points for all its divergent parties. In particular, as a result of parliamentary tactics such as the opposition's Trust Fund Filibuster the focus of public attention was drawn to a newly exciting Alberta Legislature.

However, the opposition "in house" coalition needed to effectively oppose a large governing party was torn asunder by the entrance of Mr. Kesler into the Legislature. Mr. Sindlinger would not cooperate with a separatist and the Social Credit felt is was now politically inappropriate to cooperate with the N.D.P.'s Notley. As a result the public interest in the politics and legislative proceedings that had developed from an exciting Legislature and a feisty opposition in the fall dissipated upon return to the Legislature's less exciting norm.

As is clearly evident Kesler's effect on the Alberta Legislature was rather great. In addition, the populist M.L.A.'s effect on Alberta politics in the short term was nothing less than monumental. Kesler's by-elction victory acted as a catalyst which dramatically upset the once calm waters of Alberta politics. Each established political party was forced to protect its political turf and thus had to rethink its position and strategy.

The party most directly affected by the election of Kesler was of course the Social Credit Party. A Socred by-election victory in Olds-Didsbury has been viewed as essential to the party's survival by Socreds and political commentators alike. The defeat of the local candidate, Lloyd Quantz, also spelled the public rejection of the Socred's most high profile young candidate and a potential party leader.

Although the Socreds did attempt to regain momentum and their right wing political turf at the beginning of the spring session they by and large

failed. As was clearly evident from an Alberta Report political poll taken after Kesler's victory which gave the Socreds 2% of the popular vote, the party is in its last dying gasps. The effect of a new populist on the political scene only sound the death knell for the Social Credit Party a little sooner then anticipated.

The new populist in the Alberta Legislature has also has an effect on Alberta's New Domocrat Party. Kesler's inadvertant undermining of the opposition's "in-house" coalition had relatively important ramifications for the N.D.P. Although the N.D.P. leader Grant Notley is a well versed parliamentarian, it is nonetheless difficult for a lone party member to effectively battle a large governing majority. However, as a result of the opposition's fall coalition Notley was able to put forward his positions more agressively and effectively, and in a higher public profile. Kesler's entrance onto the scene thus weakened Notley's impact, for he was no longer able to work in tandem with his opposition colleagues.

However, of more importance to the N.D.P. is what Kesler's effect might be on their traditional strongholds in the north. It has been suggested that the N.D.P. vote in northern Alberta is to a great extent a protest vote rather than a show of N.D.P. allegiance, either politically or ideologically.

Also a 1976 study done to determine the degree of western alienation in Albertans indicated that northern residents felt the most alientated. Thus, if Kesler is able to legitimate and clearly articulate the cause of the western separatism he may have a significant impact on N.D.P. electoral hopes in northern Alberta.[15]

The election of the W.C.C. leader Kesler has also had a significant affect on Alberta's governing Tory Party. Although presently sitting with a comfortable majority in the Legislature Tory leaders, particularly Premier

Lougheed, are astute enough to realize that Kesler and the W.C.C. may pose a serious challenge. As a result the Tory political strategy has altered somewhat in the hopes of deterring, if not neutralizing, this challenge.

The first ploy used to combat the populists was an obvious attempt to bolster the somewhat tarnished image of their leader, Peter Lougheed. Lougheed tried to seem "more Albertan" and began using more rural slang and analogies in his speech. (The image Albertans carry of themselves will be dealt with extensively later in the paper.) This cosmetic change was evident in both a major interview with political columnist Allen Fotheringham, published in the May 2nd Edmonton Journal, and in the Premier's speech to the annual Tory convention in March. As Calgary Herald reporter Don Truckey noted;

> The premier's speech (to the annual P.C. convention) was folksy, down home, delivered in an affected drawl directed at the rural vote that meant to say, gosh friends, we haven't forgotten you.[16]

Kesler's presence on the political scene also forced the Tories to step up their anti-Ottawa rhetoric. In an effort to keep the W.C.C. off their traditional territory, to the right on the political spectrum, Lougheed advanced some rather hardline comments at the annual Tory convention in March. In the convention's keynote address Lougheed referred to what he suggested were Federal Leberal Party attempts to push Alberta back into colonial status.

> They tried it on the constitution and we stopped them cold. They tried it on energy. We moved them from the living room to the porch. I'm beginning to think we ought to move them off the property.[17]

The Tories also tried to rally Albertans to their side again by.

suggesting that interprovincial political conflict was just what the adversary in Ottawa wanted to see. In an interview with Allan Fotheringham, the same interview referred to earlier, Lougheed implied that no one would be happier with his political problems at home than Pierre Elliot Trudeau himself.

Thus the main strategy employed by the Tories was an attempt to re-establish their image, and their leader's as the defenders of Alberta. In addition they tried to convey more of a "peoples party" image, an in touch with average Albertans' style.

The election of a new populist politician also has the effect of drawing the governing Tories out of the Legislature. As is the case with most longstanding governing parties the Tories were becoming somewhat complacent and as a result highranking party members seldom ventured out to seriously meet and discuss issues with the electorate. However, the threat posed by Kesler and the W.C.C. encouraged the Tories to send the Premier and cabinet ministers out to check the pulse of the electorate and show the party flag.

Clearly the populist M.L.A., Gordon Kesler, has had a signficant short term impact on Alberta politics. However, the essential question that must now be asked is whether he will have such an important effect on Alberta politics in the future? Will the party he leads and represents rise to the forefront of Alberta politics or recede into the boundless prairies from which it and so many populist movements have emerged?

There is little doubt that governments who must return to the voters for a mandate during these difficult economic times in Canada face a serious challenge. The examples of the recently ousted provincial governments in Manitoba and Saskatchewan are there for all to behold. However, the present economic situation poses a particularly significant threat to an Alberta Tory

administration who has historically relied on its image of "business government" and reputed ability to manage the prosperous provincial economy for re-election. As David Elton and Arthur Goddard noted;

> In the Alberta of the 1970s, the Conservative government, it would seem, bases its claim to support on its ability to manage and sustain prosperity among significant segments of the economy.[18]

Thus, in a period of economic woe in which people are disillusioned with the promises of governments the Tory administration may be faced with an uphill battle. In such times voters, and historically Alberta voters in particular, seem to be looking for different alternatives. Clearly Albertans in the past have not only searched for alternatives but have forthrightly embraced some rather unique political alternatives. Therefore, this is certainly a politically opportune time for Kesler and the W.C.C. to arrive on the political stage and may result in them playing a prominent role in Alberta politics. As V. O. Key pointed out;

> A factor of great significance in the setting off of political movements is an abrupt change for the worse in the status of one group relative to that of other groups in society. . .A rapid change for the worse, however, in the relative status of any group, rich or poor, is likely to precipitate political action.[19]

A factor which might have the most significant political impact on populist Gordon Kesler, and as a result on his effect on Alberta politics in the future, has been put forward by Roger Gibbons.

> As the prairie lifestyle comes more and more to resemble that of other metropolitan regions in Canada, and indeed North American, the distinguishing features of prairie society are being steadily

> erased. Attitudinal features, however, remain and we are left with a region of the mind, a nostalgic image of the beliefs and values of an earlier agrarian society that has been transformed almost beyond recognition.[20]

The ramifications of this region of the mind or "Alberta myth" are immense for both Kesler and Alberta's political future. It has certainly played a significant role in passing on the fears and aspirations of the quasi-colonial mentality from a Alberta generation that was a rather homogeneous agricultural class to today's largely urban middle class generation. In addition the Alberta myth has acted as a rather effective mode of political socialization for the large numbers of new Albertans that have flocked to the province. This is indicated by the fact that these influxes have not appeared to upset the provinces traditional voting patterns.

It also appears that this Alberta myth, combined with astute Tory political manoeuvring, has convinced the Alberta electorate to vote as if they were a homogenous class. While Alberta was largely composed of a homogeneous class in its infancy such is no longer the case. Thus the Tories have been able to use the fears and aspirations of the quasi-colonial mentality as a device to unit Albertans of all walks of life under their political banner. As Elton and Goddard aptly pointed out;

> What is important for the politics of Alberta in the 1970s, and perhaps longer, is the fact that Peter Lougheed and the Conservatives have articulated the fears and aspirations of the quasi-colonial mentality and made this issue of primary importance. In such a milieu, the mass electorate, it would appear, becomes depoliticized, allowing natural intergroup conflicts to be smoothered under a consensus of support for the elites in their

battle against external threats.[21]

However, the ability of the Tories to use the anti-Ottawa sentitment to their political advantage has been greatly hampered by the agreements on energy and the constitution reached with Ottawa. The fact that these agreements came after the Tories indulged in a great deal of "fed bashing", and after fostering an almost siege mentality in the province, raised serious doubts in the minds of the Alberta electorate as to the Tories' motivation and intent during this period. The shadow cast by this doubt had a significant effect on the Tories in the Olds-Didsbury by-election. As Calgary Herald reporter Don Truckey noted Lougheed "pumped up the image of rapacious easterns, and then he turned around and negotiated with them. With a smile on his face".[22]

As a result of a combination of the Alberta myth, a sagging economy, and the damage done to Peter Lougheed's image, the political star of populist Gordon Kesler, and his W.C.C., seems very high in the sky. Kesler's own image, that of a rugged, individualist, backhills cowboy is certainly no political detriment either. As Charles Lynch stated;

> The new member of the Alberta Legislature not only looks like the image Albertans carry of them selves, he sounds Albertan to the marrow of his bones.[23]

Due to the Alberta myth and the strong anti-Ottawa sentiment fostered by the Tories in the 1970s the populist W.C.C. inherits an electorate that conccives of itself as homogeneous and has the fears and aspirations of the quasi-colonial mentality. Thus Kesler emerges onto the political scene in extremely similar circumstances to those that saw the election of the populist U.F.A. in 1921 and the populist Social Credit in 1935. However, this is not to suggest that Gordon Kesler's effect on future politics will be so overpowering that he will inevitably ride into the Premier's office.

The hurdle which stands foremost in Kesler's way is a uniquely Albertan political paradox which has historically acted as an essential counterbalance in Alberta politics. Simply stated it is that in spite of the political alienation in the Alberta electorate Albertans still retain a close attachment to Canada. Therefore as Elton and Goddard stated;

> a successful Alberta party must not only maintain and develop an 'Alberta first' policy which asserts the province's independence from external forces such as the federal government or other provinces, but also display a willingness to work within the national framework for the national bien être.[24]

At this point in time it is difficult to determine whether Kesler's once strongly pro separatist stance will be an albatross around his neck. The possibility exists that he could easily shake the separatist mantle and yet retain the support of the electorate as a result of his populist platform. Regardless, this paradox does point out the political abilities of Peter Lougheed who has walked the fine line between western alienation and nationalism for a decade.

The emergence of populist M.L.A. Gordon Kesler onto the Alberta legislative and political scenes has at a minimum heralded, what is and will be, a fascinating period of Alberta politics. As to what effect this populist will have on Alberta politics and the Alberta Legislature in the future it is very difficult to discern. Will Gordon Kesler be able to stoke the fires of prairie populism in Alberta? It is much like stirring the embers of a dying fire, one never knows whether it will spark to life again or simply smoulder away.

Footnotes

1. Edmonton Journal, February 19, 1982, Charles Lynch column.
2. Peter Eiles, "A Syndrome, Not a Doctrine", Peter Gellner and Ghita Ionescu (editors), Populism: Its Meaning and National Characteristics (Great Britian: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969) p. 166.
3. Peter Sinclair, "Class Structure and Populist Protest: The Case of Western Canada", Carlo Caldarola (editor), Society and Politics in Alberta (Toronto: Methuen, 1979) p. 74.
4. Edmonton Journal, March 26, 1982, "Business Needs Boost - separatist".
5. C. B. Macpherson, Democracy in Alberta: Social Credit and the Party System (Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1953) p. 6.
6. Ibid., p. 21.
7. Ibid.
8. Paul Sharp, The Agrarian Revolt in Western Canada, (New York: Octagon Books, 1971) p. 189.
9. C. B. Macpherson, p. 220.
10. David Elton and Arthur Goddard, "The Conservative Takeover, 1971-", Carlo Caldarola (editor), Society and Politics in Alberta (Toronto: Methuen, 1979) p. 68.
11. Ibid., p. 67
12. Edmonton Journal, March 2, 1982, Don Braid column.
13. Roger Gibbons, "Western Alienation and the Alberta Political Culture", Carlo Caldarola (editor), Society and Politics in Alberta (Toronto: Methuen, 1979) p. 162.
14. Edmonton Journal, March 31, 1982, Don Braid column.

15. Roger Gibbons, p. 150.
16. Calgary Herald, April 13, 1982, "Alberta Pulse: Has Lougheed Lost Its Feel?"
17. Calgary Herald, March 23, 1982, Merv Anderson column.
18. David Elton and Arthur Goddard, p. 68.
19. Paul Stolee, Toward An Understanding of Alberta Provincial Politics (a research paper for Political Science 499, University of Alberta) p. 12.
20. Roger Gibbons, p. 164.
21. David Elton and Arthur Goddard, p. 68.
22. Calgary Herald, April 13, 1982, "Alberta Pulse: Has Lougheed Lost Its Feel?"
23. Edmonton Journal, February 19, 1982, Charles Lynch column.
24. David Elton and Arthur Goddard, p. 68.

Bibliography

Caldarola, Carlo (editor), Society and Politics in Alberta, Toronto, 1979, Methuen.

Canovan, Margaret, Populism, U.S.A., 1981, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Englemann, Frederick C., Political Parties and the Canadian Social Structure, Scarborough, 1967, Prentice-Hall of Canada Ltd.

Gellner, Ernest and Ionescu, Ghita, Populism: Its Meanings and National Characteristics, Great Britian, 1969, Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Macpherson, C.B. Democracy in Alberta: Social Credit and the Party System, Canada, 1953, University of Toronto Press.

Rolph, William Kirby, Henry Wise Wood of Alberta, Canada, 1950, University of Toronto Press.

Sharp, Paul F., The Agrarian Revolt in Western Canada, New York, 1971, Octagon Books.

Stolee, Paul, Toward an Understanding of Alberta Provincial Politics, a research paper for Political Science 499, University of Alberta.

Thornburn, Hugh G., Party Politics in Canada, Scarborough, 1972, Prentice-Hall of Canada Ltd.